

PLANNING AHEAD

Notes for the Planning Community

Volume 3, Issue 3

March 2000

In This Issue

Senior Planning Vacancies	1
Review Branch Has Moved!	3
Items of Note - On the Web.....	3
Coastal America - National Corporate Wetlands Restoration Partnership	3
Maritime Trade and Transportation 99.....	4
National Summaries of U.S. Waterborne Commerce– CY 1998	5
Update On Activities of U.S. Section of International Navigation Association (PIANC).....	5
Release of New Version of IWR-PLAN Software	6
Negotiating Agreements	6
A New Partnership For the Corps: The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation - Case Study #5: The Lake George Weir Project.....	7
Improving Environmental Evaluation	8
Conference on Effectively Restoring Ecosystems	9
FEMA/ Army Sign HMGP MOA.....	9
Clean Water Action Plan Update--The UFP.....	9
Flood Damage to Roads	10
One Good Idea	11
WHERE, OH WHERE, HAS BOB GONE?.....	11
Openings in Environmental PROSPECT Courses	11
Subscribing to Planning Ahead.....	12
Submissions Deadline.....	12

(Ed. Note – Click on the page number in the Table of Contents to jump to the specific article. To return to the Table of Contents, click on the [book icon](#).)

Senior Planning Vacancies

We have created this special section in *Planning Ahead* to highlight vacancy announcements for senior planning positions, especially planning chief positions. We encourage all divisions and districts to place senior planner position announcements in *Planning Ahead* to give them greater visibility. Also you can find most vacancy announcements at <http://cpol.army.mil/va/scripts/public.html>

Buffalo District

Organization: U.S. Army Engineer District, Buffalo, Engineering and Planning Division, Planning Branch

Duties: Serves as the GS- 14 Chief of the Planning Branch. Develops, coordinates and manages the District's General Investigation, Continuing Authorities, Flood Plain Management and Special Studies Program. Exercises executive management of the Planning Branch: Plans, schedules, coordinates, supervises and guides all activities of the Branch to accomplish all mission functions. Represents the District Engineer in contacts with public, private, management officials, Federal, State and municipal officials. Advises on applicable laws, regulations, policies and procedures of the Corps of Engineers related to proposed and on-going Civil Works projects. Represents the District in the negotiation of Architect-Engineer (A-E) contracts for planning studies in connection with authorized or proposed civil works projects. Exercises staff supervision and overall management responsibilities for all activities of the branch. Designs, develops and promulgates working procedures, policies and methods for the guidance of Planning Branch staff. Interprets directives, policy guidance, laws and regulations and advises staff on their applications. Outlines broad work assignments to Planning Branch staff, including supplemental instructions to accomplish the required mission objectives and goals. Assures adherence to established policies, procedures, directives and accepted principles for planning efforts. Makes selection for all positions in Planning Branch. Deals with position management issues and changes in jobs. Establishes performance standards and evaluates the performance of all personnel in the branch. Provides EEO program support. Hears and resolves complaints and grievances. Identifies training needs and assures training is provided. Administers a variety of management programs such as safety, upward mobility, sick leave, overtime use, hours of work and suggestions.

Vacancy Announcement No. FT006373 ; Opening Date: March 17, 2000 ; Closing Date: April 17, 2000

Also listed under: Vacancy Announcement No. FTU000495 ; Opening Date: March 20, 2000 ; Closing Date: April 19, 2000

Sacramento District

The Planning Division, Sacramento District, South Pacific Division is seeking a GS-13 Branch Chief for a 120 day +/- TDY assignment. The Position is interdisciplinary GS-810/0101/0401/0807/1301, and is one of 4 GS-13 Plan Formulation positions in Planning Division.

The Chief, American River/Great Basin Branch would be responsible for the full range of plan formulation activities in central California, Northern Nevada, Utah, and parts of Colorado and Wyoming. In as much as there is a large program being administered by the 15 employees in the branch at this time, depth of experience in plan formulation and related activities is essential. A working knowledge of CEFMS, PROMIS, MS-PROJECT and the Corps Project Management Business Process is also important. The purpose of this assignment is to ensure continual execution of a large and varied Civil Works Planning program while a permanent branch chief is under recruitment. The need is immediate. This is an excellent opportunity for those seeking geographic/functional diversity and experience in their resumes. Please feel free to contact Mark Capik, Acting Chief, Planning Division at (916) 557-5301 if there are questions.



Review Branch Has Moved!

The Policy Review Branch has completed their move to the Pulaski Building. Therefore, any items (i.e., documents, reports, and PCA packages) being mailed to the Policy Review Branch should be addressed as follows:

HQUSACE, CECW-AR
ATTN: Policy Review Branch
20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW.
Washington, DC 20314-1000



Items of Note - On the Web

Ellen Cummings - CECW-PD

You can click on <http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/usace-docs/> to get to the main page and then the “What’s New” link to keep track of the new publications. Recent publications of note:

- ER 690-1-1203 on Corporate Recruitment and Selection <http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/usace-docs/eng-regs/er690-1-1203/toc.htm>




Coastal America - National Corporate Wetlands Restoration Partnership

John Wright – CENAD-ET-P

The Corps of Engineers will soon be able to tap another resource to support ecosystem restoration. Primarily, addressing aquatic systems, this new resource is being developed by the Coastal America Federal Partnership in conjunction with the business interests of Corporate America. The purpose of this new program termed the National Corporate Wetland Restoration Partnership (NCWRP) is to facilitate collaboration between the federal government, state agencies and private corporations to restore degraded freshwater and saltwater wetlands and other aquatic habitats. NCWRP partners will include private industry, the federal office of the Coastal America Partnership (representing 12 federal departments and agencies), state agencies, non-profit organizations, and academia.

The Partnership is being designed to foster collaboration between the federal government, state agencies and private corporations. Private corporations that participate will donate funds for either site specific wetland or other aquatic habitat restoration projects or to provide matching funds to a national or regional effort in support of aquatic ecosystem restoration activities. Projects that will receive funds will all be approved Coastal America projects and, as such, will have federal programs involved to oversee their proper execution. The Coastal America Partnership will coordinate among all of its Regional Implementation Teams to identify the appropriate private foundation or state trust fund will receive funds from the National Corporate Wetlands Restoration Program.

The origin of this program lies in the Northeast. In 1994, Coastal America partners signed a resolution with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to restore wetlands and other aquatic ecosystems. Since 1994 *The Resolution to Restore Massachusetts Wetlands* has resulted in more than \$3 million in federal support for the Commonwealth's restoration efforts. Recognition of the need for cost-share funds to match federal and state monies resulted in the evolution of the concept of a Corporate Wetlands Restoration Partnership (CWRP) for Massachusetts. In early 1999 an agreement was signed between The Gillette Company, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to create the CWRP for Massachusetts. To date, 17 corporations have joined the Massachusetts program, contributing over \$1 Million. This was a landmark agreement between federal, state and private organizations to work together, as partners; to achieve common goals through corporate partner contributions as well as federal and state cost share programs. Several major wetland restoration projects have already been initiated as a result of the CWRP. Groundbreaking ceremonies are scheduled for one such project, Sagamore Marsh, for April 2000.

Recognizing the value of this unique public/private partnership, planning is underway to take the concept nationwide. Once finalized- a spring 2000 kickoff is planned- the NCWRP will manage industry contributions on a regional and state-by-state basis under the Coastal America framework and in so doing provide another tool supporting the Corps' aquatic ecosystem restoration programs. 

Maritime Trade and Transportation 99

Arlene L.Dietz, Director, Navigation Data Center

The U.S. Department of Transportation recently released a new publication, **Maritime Trade and Transportation 99**. It offers valuable coverage of the following topics: Waterborne trade (through 1997), shipbuilding, waterborne transportation and the U.S. economy, safety and environment, national security, navigation technologies and maritime data issues. According to the report's summary, "This report describes major trends in the 1990s that affect commercial water transportation industry, which provides vital freight and passenger travel services in international and domestic markets and port and cargo handling services."


Examples of the information contained in this report are as follows: "The Bureau of Transportation Statistics estimates that freight rate per ton-mile for rail transportation is about four times that for water transportation (USDOT BTS 1998a)"; and that "Real GDP from water transportation is expected to increase at an average annual rate of about 2 percent per year from 1998 to 2003(McGraw Hill 1999). This is less than the projected growth in international waterborne trades (4.6 percent per year), but above the projected growth for domestic trades (1 percent per year)."

The Navigation Data Center has obtained copies for further distribution to the Corps. Contact Joyce Smith at 703-428-6091 to request a copy. 

National Summaries of U.S. Waterborne Commerce– CY 1998

Arlene L. Dietz, Director, Navigation Data Center

Do you need a ready-made pie chart of principal commodity groups moving by water? Would you like a table of supporting statistics? If so, go to www.wrsc.usace.army.mil/ndc and click on waterborne commerce to find the publication and the ready-made graphics.

You will find regional waterway summaries as well. Each region has a display of 20 years of commerce by major commodity groups. For example, you will discover that during calendar year 1998 Great Lakes traffic reached 192.2 million tons, this surpassed all others years during the period from 1980 to 1997. 

Update On Activities of U.S. Section of International Navigation Association (PIANC)


Thomas M. Ballentine - Navigation Analysis Division, IWR

In response to an invitation from Mr. Kurt Nagle, President of the American Association of Port Authorities (AAPA), and the U.S. Section of the PIANC was host to a breakfast program at the annual Spring Conference of the port association. The breakfast was held in Washington, D.C. on Tuesday, March 21st. Mr. Nagle introduced Mr. Ballentine who offered remarks regarding the role PIANC plays in support of the development and dissemination of technical information concerning inland and maritime ports and waterways throughout the world, its association with the AAPA, and the 98 years of support provided by the Corps of Engineers towards advancing the efforts of PIANC.

The guest speaker at the breakfast meeting was Dr. James F. Johnson, Chief of Planning and Policy Division at the Corps' Headquarters office. In his presentation, Dr. Johnson emphasized the role and responsibility of the Corps to bring national water resources needs to the attention of decision makers. As an example, he cited the need for improvements to the nation's ports so as to maintain the nation's competitive position in international commerce and trade.

Concerning this fiscal year's civil works appropriation, Dr. Johnson noted that 44 percent is directed towards ports and inland navigation projects. The FY 2001 budget request contains a similar proportion of expenditures directed towards navigation.

Other topics which Dr. Johnson addressed included the development of dredged material management plans, which are prepared by the Corps' District offices and which include disposal alternatives and the use of dredged material as a beneficial resource; and the development of a strategy for the Marine Transportation System 2020 initiative.

In closing, Dr. Johnson reiterated the importance of, and requested the assistance of, the port and navigation representatives to work with the Corps in accomplishing projects that will benefit the citizens of the United States. 

Release of New Version of IWR-PLAN Software

Leigh Skaggs, CEWRC-IWR-R

The Institute for Water Resources (IWR) released a new version of IWR-PLAN decision support software – Version 3.0 – on March 15, 2000. Originally designed to support decision-making for ecosystem restoration and mitigation planning, IWR-PLAN can be applied to a variety of planning situations in which the outputs or benefits of the alternatives being considered are not monetized.

Two important functions of the software are its abilities to assist in the formulation and in the evaluation of alternative plans. IWR-PLAN's formulation routine builds alternative plans from combinations of user-provided management measures or solutions. The software calculates the additive effect of those alternative plans on up to 10 user-defined variables, such as cost and output. IWR-PLAN also evaluates alternatives through cost effectiveness and incremental cost analyses (CE/ICA). CE/ICA are used to evaluate alternative plans when project benefits are not measured in dollars and benefit-cost analyses cannot be performed. CE/ICA are required by Corps guidance for ecosystem restoration and mitigation evaluations because the environmental benefits provided by those kinds of projects are typically quantified in some environmental metric and not monetized. CE/ICA help to identify the most efficient alternative plan for any given level of environmental output, and also to compare the incremental environmental outputs of successively more expensive ecosystem restoration plans. IWR-PLAN software identifies those alternative plans that are the best financial investments (the “cost effective” and “best buy” plans) and displays the effects of each plan on a range of decision variables.

IWR-PLAN can be used on computers running Windows 95, 98, 2000, or NT operating systems. It is a stand-alone application that does not require any other proprietary software applications be installed. Enhancements to IWR-PLAN Version 3.0 include the ability to import and export data from Excel spreadsheets; a guided “walk-through” option for novice users; and such additional graphical and reporting options as the capability to run the analyses on one output parameter (e.g., aquatic habitat), while displaying the effects on another output parameter (e.g., sediment reduction).

IWR-PLAN is free and available to download via the IWR web site (<http://www.wrsc.usace.army.mil/iwr>). The web site includes basic and advanced user instructions, frequently asked questions, a news board for information updates, and student tutorial exercises. Training workshops are available on a reimbursable basis. Please contact IWR-PLAN program manager Leigh Skaggs (telephone: 703-428-9091; e-mail: lawrence.l.skaggs@usace.army.mil) for additional information.



Negotiating Agreements

John Burns - CECW-PE, Howard Goldman – CECC-G, Kay Hutchinson - CESPK

Negotiating an agreement with a non-Federal project sponsor, whether it is a Project Cooperation Agreement or Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement (FCSA), can be a difficult task. The non-Federal sponsor typically wants terms different than those embodied in our model agreements. One question that comes up more often than not on FCSAs is whether we can support exceptions to the rules providing strict limits on project costs? A sponsor may have a finite amount of money--and not a penny more. They may be unwilling to agree to the FCSA as presently drafted because it does not reflect this cost limitation. The current estimated cost generally takes into account some amount for contingencies and

the non-Federal sponsor can provide up to 50 percent of its share of costs as work –in- kind. Notwithstanding this, the non-Federal sponsor may still be unwilling or unable to execute the model agreement. Where does the Corps negotiator go from here?

As a starting point, we cannot limit the non-Federal share. It is fixed by statute as 50 percent of total study costs. There are, however, several options that can be explored. At a minimum, the non-Federal sponsor should be advised that under the terms and conditions of the model FCSA either party to the FCSA can terminate the study with 30 days notice. It may also be possible to reduce the scope of the study so that the total estimated cost to the sponsor, including contingencies, is well below the non-Federal sponsor's maximum limit.

There are several other possibilities. One is to use the voluntary cost cap. This would not limit the non-Federal sponsor's share to a fixed amount, but would at least put us into a holding pattern until a decision can be made on whether to proceed with the study and where the sponsor can get the money from. Another option is to make use of the "excess study costs" language that Congress specifically added in WRDA 96. Payment of excess study costs is deferred until a later point in time. Again, there is no forgiveness of the non-Federal share, but payment gets delayed, without any interest due. The final possibility is to consider phasing the study, with options to proceed to the next phase, as funds become available. All of this, of course, is subject to a decision whether it is reasonable to proceed with the study under these conditions. Nor should we put federal dollars at risk to stop a study before completion, at the 92% mark, for example, because the sponsor refuses to ante up additional dollars. That is a waste of taxpayer money.

By using the above options, we hope that Districts are able to adequately address this sensitive issue with our feasibility study sponsors. 

A New Partnership For the Corps: The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation - Case Study #5: The Lake George Weir Project

Cheree Peterson - National Fish and Wildlife Foundation

The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (Foundation) is excited by the possibilities of working with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' (Corps) as the Corps fulfills its environmental mission. Since the Corps has a variety of authorities that coincide with the Foundation's mission of conserving fish, wildlife, and plants, the Foundation hopes to support the Corps' restoration work (please see previous newsletters for background on the Foundation).

One of the Corps' authorities presenting a good partnership opportunity is the Corps' Section 1135 program. Where the Foundation has private funds available, the Foundation could provide funds to help finance the local cost-share of a project. The first such opportunity to partner came from the Corps' Vicksburg District, a Section 1135 project entitled the Lake George Weir Ecosystem Restoration Project.

The local sponsors are Yazoo County and the Yazoo County Soil and Water Conservation District, and the project will restore approximately 450 acres of aquatic and wetland habitat in an area that experiences low flow conditions in late summer and fall. The Corps and the local sponsor propose to construct a weir to hold water within the banks of Lake George and Panther Creek during low river stages. The construction of the weir at the mouth of Lake George will improve and sustain fisheries production through the low water period and provide long-term stability for aquatic communities. The

weir will also increase available water in October and November, attracting and holding early migratory waterfowl. Furthermore, the additional water capacity will increase the extent duration of shoreline and water depth for water-dependent terrestrial species.

The Yazoo County Soil and Water Conservation District, at the recommendation of the Vicksburg District, came to the Foundation seeking financial assistance with the local share of the project. While the Conservation District raised some of the local cost share through in-kind contributions, they had been unable to come up with the full 25% and came to the Foundation requesting \$54,000. The Foundation had private, non-federal funds available because of a partnership with Shell Oil Corporation (the Shell Marine Habitat Program) to fund restoration projects in the Gulf of Mexico and the Mississippi Delta. Since the Conservation District proposed to match the \$54,000 with \$375,000 of in-kind services, the Conservation District could easily meet the Foundation's matching requirement of two matching grantee dollars for every one Foundation dollar (6.9:1 in this case).

Given the excellent ratio of matching funds, the availability of private, non-federal funds, and the project's goal of aquatic and wetlands habitat restoration, the project was brought before the Foundation's Board of Directors. In early March, the Foundation's Board approved the project, thereby taking advantage of the next step in promoting the Corps' partnership with the Foundation.


As private funds become available throughout the country, the Foundation hopes to assist local sponsors in meeting their cost share requirements in future Section 1135 projects. The Foundation looks to the Corps to direct local sponsors to the Foundation and for the Corps to participate in the review of these projects so as to determine which projects will benefit the most from Foundation support.

peterston@nfwf.org 

Improving Environmental Evaluation

Lynn Martin, CEWRC-IWR-P.

At the request of Jim Johnson, IWR has initiated a study to improve the Corps environmental evaluation as part of the Policy Studies Program. This is, in part, in response to discussions at a recent Planning Chief's meeting concerning a broader effort to undertake a review of assessment methodologies across a wide range of Civil Works programs. In this effort IWR will examine methods for characterizing and measuring the outputs of ecosystem restoration measures/projects and will try to develop an overall framework within which these projects should be evaluated. The results of this study will be useful in improving our ability to analyze alternatives, discuss the value of recommended projects with sponsors and stakeholders, and ultimately improve performance assessment related to Civil Works ecosystem restoration investments.

Additionally we will be seeking your input on innovative approaches that you may have developed or used that warrant consideration for broader application. This will be a topic at the upcoming Conference on Effectively Restoring Ecosystems (see following article). Perhaps you have found or developed some community or bioeconomic models which work for you? Or, perhaps you have used some combination of methods such as HEP, IBI and water quality parameters to help broadly characterize and measure project outputs? Have you considered using the concept of ecosystem services to assess project outputs? If so, we would be interested in hearing from you! Please send me and/ or Gene Stakhiv an e-mail message, or contact me at 703-428-8065. 

Conference on Effectively Restoring Ecosystems

Cheryl A. Smith, CECW-PD

The combined conference for Environmental Planning and Continuing Authorities Program will be held 22-24 August 2000, from 0800 to 1700 daily. The St. Louis District has invited us to their fair city and arranged for conference facilities at the Regal Riverfront Hotel, 200 S 4th Street, in the downtown area. As indicated by the title - and theme - the conference will focus on the Corps ecosystem restoration capabilities and authorities including the CAP program. Attendees will share information and experiences as well as examine issues within the context of the project delivery process. In addition, proposed sessions will provide updates on policy, guidance and initiatives, case study presentations, tool demonstrations and an assessment of environmental planning needs in light of future operating capabilities. A draft agenda will be coordinated during the first week in April. [📖](#)

FEMA/ Army Sign HMGP MOA

Jan Rasgus – CECW-AA

The memorandum of agreement between the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the Department of the Army regarding the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) and the Corps of Engineers flood damage reduction projects was signed on March 29, 2000 by Michael J. Armstrong, Associate Director for Mitigation, FEMA, and Joseph W. Westpahl, Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works). The MOA establishes the basic policy regarding the construction of flood damage reduction levees on lands acquired with HMGP funds. In the future, construction of flood damage reduction structures will be prohibited on lands acquired with HMGP funds. In cases where lands have already been acquired using HMGP funds and where a Corps project is currently under consideration, FEMA and the Corps will review the project to determine if any flood damage reduction structures can be constructed on those lands. Detailed implementation guidance is being prepared by CECW-P. [📖](#)

Clean Water Action Plan Update--The UFP

Beverley B. Getzen - CECW-PF

The draft Unified Federal Policy for Watershed Management on Federal Lands (UFP) was published in the Federal Register on 22 February 2000. The comment period ends 24 April 2000. Listening Sessions have been conducted in Portland, OR; Atlanta, GA; Milwaukee, WI; and Denver, CO. Corps representatives were present at each meeting. At several, the attendance was slight, with few comments being provided by the general public or the Tribes. The meetings were valuable to the Federal family in helping to achieve a common understanding of what the policy is and is not, and to address some of the obvious questions about timing, application, implementation and resources for the watershed assessments.

The Denver meeting, which I attended, drew quite a large group of Federal agency representatives, a fair representation of Native American tribal representatives and some members of the general public. The discussions there were lively and produced a number of good and perceptive

comments regarding the policy as applied in watersheds that are "shared" in ownership among Federal, state, tribal and private citizens. Other comments deal with the consistent application of a scientific approach to watershed assessment on the Federal lands, the procedures for delineation and classification, and the actions that would result from analyzing the assessments once completed. The USFS Content Analysis Enterprise Team gathered all the input and will organize the comments for us (the CWAP UFP team) to use in considering revisions to the policy. If all goes well, there could be a final policy early this summer. If you attended one of the listening sessions, please share your comments with me.

Notifications of the availability of the draft UFP were provided by several elements of HQ, including Planning Division, Operations Division and the Public Affairs Office. If you have not yet gotten a copy to review, ask your MSC or district CWAP POC, Operations Branch or PAO office for a copy. Or, you can contact me directly via e-mail or at (202) 761-1980 and I'll furnish you a set of the documents. Each MSC is consolidating comments within its region so that one set of comments from each division can be submitted to HQ. So, your individual comments should be provided to your CWAP POC or to the Operations Branch staff for submission to the MSC coordinator for consolidation. Operations Division staff here and I will review all the comments and prepare the final set reflecting the views of the Corps of Engineers to the interagency team and the CWAP Principals. Many of you commented on the earlier draft last summer during the preliminary internal comment period. As a result, the Corps has already stated its agreement with the basic tenets of the policy as now presented.

Your input will be valuable in helping to finalize the policy and to prepare for the Corps implementation guidance which will follow. I would especially be interested in your views on the opportunities this policy may provide to undertake watershed assessment and watershed management on our Corps properties as well as opportunities for working cooperatively with sponsors and adjacent landholders on improved management of watersheds.


States and Tribes both have indicated keen interest in the implementation of the UFP as the natural follow on to the initial round of Unified Watershed Assessments and the Watershed Restoration Action Strategies which are now in preparation in many states and by several of the tribes. Those UWAs did not include any extensive independent assessment of Federally managed watersheds even though in many cases those watersheds were identified by others as priority for restoration. Now we'll have the opportunity to conduct assessments on our own project lands and develop watershed management plans in coordination with adjacent owners, states and tribes, as time, staff and funding resources permit in future years. [!\[\]\(0f848bbd71cef6b345273b16f905912a_img.jpg\)](#)

Flood Damage to Roads

Stuart Davis –CEWRSC-IWR-R

IWR is investigating background information and devising a research strategy for estimating expected annual flood damage to public roads. The work is intended to assess the significance of the problem and to increase the efficiency and accuracy of road damage estimates by identifying and documenting field-tested procedures and useful data sources. Please contact Stuart Davis at IWR if you have ideas or useful information to share on this topic. His phone number is 703/428-7086. [!\[\]\(de95854c7ee024cfadc48187bbb781b2_img.jpg\)](#)


One Good Idea

We are trying to start a new feature with this issue to highlight a successful approach to solving a planning problem or to share important information among planners. Please send me your contributions and we will include them here. (Ed.) 

WHERE, OH WHERE, HAS BOB GONE?

Yes, the rumors are true: Bob Daniel retired at the end of 1999. We walked down to where he used to sit and found it vacated! But there is very good news about his retirement. Bob and Mary have moved to Gettysburg, PA, where they are having a new home built on their land. Meanwhile, they are renting and relaxing. The new home plans are set and Bob thinks construction will begin very soon.

Just before Bob departed, he received a wonderful accolade for his dedicated service to the Corps. Bob was the very deserving recipient of the **Superior Civilian Service Award**. Of course, for those of you who knew Bob, you will also know that he definitely did not wish any special attention and tried to slink away with little notice, except at the Dubliner.

Bob promised to keep in touch, (oh, yeah, we've heard that before) but we will make him abide by that promise and track him down frequently. Both Bob and Mary seem happy with the decision and the move. Bob sends his usual regards to his friends and colleagues in the Corps. We'll keep you posted on Bob-sightings as they pour in. 

Openings in Environmental PROSPECT Courses

Below is a list of those environmental related courses for which spaces are still available. If interested in enrolling in any of these courses, please have a Request for Training form (DD Form 1556) completed at your district and forwarded to the Registrar's Office in Huntsville. POCs are Jackie Moore or Sherry Whitaker. Tel: 256-895-7421/7425. Fax: 256-895-7469. POC for further information is John Buckley. Tel: 256-895-7431. Fax: 256-895-7497. e-mail: John.P.Buckley@HND01.usace.army.mil.

Ctl No	Course Title	City	State	Start Date	End Date	Tuition
86	CIVIL WORK ORIENTATION	DALLAS	TX	24-Apr-00	28-Apr-00	\$1,340
86	CIVIL WORK ORIENTATION	NEW ORLEANS	LA	15-May-00	19-May-00	\$1,340
86	CIVIL WORK ORIENTATION	CHICAGO	IL	19-Jun-00	23-Jun-00	\$1,340
263	COASTAL ECOLOGY	MONTEREY	CA	8-May-00	12-May-00	\$2,700
264	ECOS PLN/MGT ISSUES	NEW ORLEANS	LA	24-Jul-00	28-Jul-00	\$1,520
272	FUND WETLANDS	ANNAPOLIS	MD	5-Jun-00	9-Jun-00	\$1,900
272	FUND WETLANDS	OLYMPIA	WA	7-Aug-00	11-Aug-00	\$1,900
163	HIST STRUCT SKILL CRAFTS	WASHINGTON	DC	23-Apr-00	28-Apr-00	\$1,610
315	PCA FINANCIAL PLAN DEV	SEATTLE	WA	15-Aug-00	18-Aug-00	\$1,650

100	REGULATORY I	ALBUQUERQUE	NM	19-Jun-00	23-Jun-00	\$800
332	REGULATORY IIA	DENVER	CO	24-Jul-00	28-Jul-00	\$840
325	REGULATORY III	HUNTSVILLE	AL	26-Jun-00	29-Jun-00	\$870
281	RIPARIAN ECOL/MGT	HARLINGEN	TX	1-May-00	5-May-00	\$2,050
281	RIPARIAN ECOL/MGT	MISSOULA	MT	26-Jun-00	30-Jun-00	\$2,050
161	RIVER & WETLANDS	DAVIS	CA	11-Sep-00	15-Sep-00	\$1,870
164	WATER & WATERSHED	DAVIS	CA	17-Jul-00	21-Jul-00	\$1,700
239	WET MIT BANK DEV/MGT	ORLANDO	FL	26-Jun-00	30-Jun-00	\$1,770



Subscribing to Planning Ahead

To subscribe or to our distribution list, send an e-mail message to majordomo@usace.army.mil with no subject line and only a single line of text in the message body.

That single line of text should be: "subscribe ls-planningahead"

To obtain a 'help' file, send only the word 'help' in the text of the message (nothing in the subject line) and address it to majordomo@usace.army.mil.

The web site for additional information is: <http://eml01.usace.army.mil/other/listserv.html> 

Submissions Deadline

The deadline for material for the next issue is **21 April 2000**

Planning Ahead, is an unofficial publication authorized under AR 25-30. It is published by the Planning Division, Directorate of Civil Works, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 20 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20314-1000, (<http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/functions/cw/cecwnews.htm>) TEL 202-761-1969 or FAX 202-761-1972 or e-mail Harry.E.Kitch@usace.army.mil.

